R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 515 UD 004 080

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS FROM THE EDUCATOR'S VIEWPOINT.

BY- TURNER, FRANCIS A.

PUB DATE 29 APR 62

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.68 15P.

DESCRIPTORS- SCHOOL INTEGRATION, *BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY, *RACIAL BALANCE, *DEFACTO SEGREGATION, *EDUCATIONAL EQUALITY, SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION, SCHOOL ZONING, SPECIAL SERVICES, OPEN ENROLLMENT, MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN, PERSONNEL, POPULATION TRENDS, STUDENT ENROLLMENT, TRANSFER PROGRAMS, NEW YORK CITY

REVIEWED ARE THE EFFORTS OF THE NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR ACHIEVING EDUCATIONAL EQUALITY. NEW SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN MINORITY GROUP AREAS, ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND CLASSES, AND NEW ZONING CRITERIA ARE NOTED. THE MOST EFFECTIVE NEW APPROACHES, BOTH AN OUTGROWTH OF THE LARGE INCREASE IN THE NEGRO AND PUERTO RICAN COMPOSITION OF THE SCHOOL POPULATION, HAVE BEEN THE IMPROVED UTILIZATION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND THE OPEN ENROLLMENT POLICY. DESCRIBED IS THE PERMISSIVE VOLUNTARY POLICY OF OPEN ENROLLMENT WHICH INVOLVED DESIGNATING CERTAIN SCHOOLS AS "SENDING" SCHOOLS (85-90 PERCENT OR MORE WITH NEGRO AND/OR PUERTO RICAN POPULATIONS) AND "RECEIVING" SCHOOLS (UNDER-UTILIZED AND MORE EQUITABLY BALANCED). HOWEVER, IT IS FELT THAT HOUSING PATTERNS DETERMINE AREAS OF MINORITY GROUP DENSITY. IT IS THUS STILL ESSENTIAL TO REPLACE DECAYED SCHOOLS EVEN IF DE FACTO SEGREGATION IS PERPETUATED. THESE SCHOOLS CAN ALSO PROVIDE RECREATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS. THIS ARTICLE IS PUBLISHED IN PROCEEDINGS OF THE INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE ON NORTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION--PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS, P.31-45. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED014515

Chairman:

The next speaker who has been wrestling with some of the problems just outlined by Will Maslow and Dr. Clark, a man that I knew and worked with when I was assistant to the Mayor of New York, is a man who is responsible to an important degree for achieving some of the results that we have achieved in this field and who knows the reasons why we haven't gone any further than we have. He is an Assistant Superintendent of Schools for the New York City Board of Education. I am pleased to present to you Mr. Francis A. Turner.

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS FROM THE EDUCATOR'S VIEWPOINT

Mr. Francis A. Turner, Assistant Superintendent
New York City Board of Education

UD004080

The words of the May 17, 1954 unanimous Supreme Court decision on public education ("We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal") will live in history for being as important in their significance for the people of America as any conclusion this Court has ever reached.

The Board of Education of New York City had long operated on the principle that equal educational opportunity for all children, regardless of economic, national, religious or racial backgrounds is essential to the continuation of American democratic society. It interpreted the May 17 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court as a legal and moral reaffirmation of its own fundamental educational principles. In June 1954, when the charge was made that de facto segregation existed in New York City, this was, in effect, a challenge to the Board to re-examine the racial composition of its schools to see wherein they failed to meet the concept of "Equality of Education".

As a result of this challenge, a Commission on Integration was appointed. This was subdivided into the Subcommissions on Educational Stimulation and Placement, Educational Standards and Curriculum, Community Relations and

Information, Physical Plant and Maintenance, Teachers' Assignments and Personnel, and Zoning.

Only those who were on the 27 member Commission on Integration and its various subcommissions, the representatives of civic groups interested in public education, and the representatives of federated parents groups, have any appreciable notion of the amount of dedicated effort that went into the area surveys and the preparation of the Commission's reports. These efforts, and the driving force of the Board Members and the Superintendent of Schools, combined to refine the policy recommendations to the point of acceptability.

Before 1920, segregated schools were permitted in New York State. They were not declared illegal until that year. Since then, some schools in New York became segregated on a de facto basis because people of like ethnic backgrounds had clustered mainly in four large areas in the same number of boroughs.

Much of the housing in these areas had been discarded by other groups, and many of the schools, like the houses, were old. In some of these same sections, congested tenements had created crowded schools. So, by the happenstance of ghetto living, you had not only over-utilized schools, but schools composed mainly of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils, as well. The concentration of racial and ethnic minorities had created schools which were not completely in accord with the principles of equal educational opportunity for all children. Both majority and minority group children were therefore being subjected to the disadvantages of education in isolation.

To correct these situations to the degree possible in the face of the extensive areas in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens in which racial minorities were living in segregated patterns - to integrate or desegregate as many schools as possible, to give more pupils the advantages to be gained from an education in schools with a varied ethnic composition, to build new schools where they were needed even in segregated neighborhoods, if they were to be for elementary grade children (but to furnish the special services and adequate teaching personnel, and to so equip and supply these schools that they would be second to none) - to achieve these things in a mammoth city like New York, was the herculean educational task which the Board of Education and the superintendents of schools set for themselves.

School Construction

Some progress has been made. The steps taken through June 1960 have been reported in "Toward Greater Opportunity - A Progress Report from the Superintendent of Schools to the Board of Education".

Since this report was issued, 13 new schools have been built in areas peopled largely by minority groups.

Sites have already been selected for several additional buildings, and 25 are planned for construction in these crowded areas, within the next three years.

Personnel

As to personnel, the expense budget for 1962 in the Elementary Division requested 105 guidance counselors; 77 were granted. 89 additional classes were requested for the junior guidance program; all of these were granted. 134 teachers for schools with special needs were requested, but none of these were granted. There was a request for 357 teachers for special service schools; the budget allowed 240. Instead of the 250 teachers initially requested for remedial reading, we received 273. We asked for 109 additional teachers for the non-English speaking child, and received 30. In addition, we received $1,903,000 for teacher-aid employment towards the 1,549,640 hours of such employment that were requested.

Among other requests, the junior high school 1962 expense budget called for:

132 additional positions for 44 special service schools; 116 were granted.

23 additional positions for Open Enrollment Schools; none were granted.

200 career guidance positions to cut back on junior high school dropouts; 65 were granted for September 1962 and 65 more for September 1963.

As yet, no decision has been reached concerning the requested 427,500 hours of teacher aids.

The high school 1962 expense budget requests include allocations for:

1266 additional teaching positions

491 positions to be used for helping children who have reading and speech handicaps

Teacher training programs

Improved guidance services

Extensions of the cooperative education and advanced placement programs

As yet, no decision has been reached concerning these requests.

The shortage of teachers is still felt in many schools. With the regularly appointed teacher index set at 75%, staffing difficult schools is still one of the unsolved problems, even with the partially successful efforts of the Assistant Superintendents Committee created to arrange for on street or other parking for teachers who live great distances from the difficult schools in which they work.

Zoning

Before the Commission on Integration was formed, and previous to the report of the Sub-Commission on Zoning - five criteria were used when a school zone was drawn: Safety, distance required to reach the school, the topographical conditions in the area, transportation facilities available and, as a determinant of the size of the area, the continuity of education afforded.

Now a sixth criterion - that of integration - was included, and it was recommended that "all members of the professional staff, especially those concerned with the location of schools, and the assignment of children, be instructed to seize every opportunity to implement this principle". *

Population Changes

The most effective procedures for integration in New York City schools, at least on the basis of the numbers

* Toward Integration In Our Schools, Final Report of the Commission on Integration, page 17.

involved, have been the Improved Utilization of School Buildings Program and the Open Enrollment Program. Although the re-zoning of schools and site selection have had some effect on integration, open enrollment and a more balanced use of school space are the means through which the Central Zoning Unit has counteracted to a degree the effects of extensive changes in school populations (involving the loss of "others" and the increase of the Negro and Puerto Rican populations) over the last five years.

Let us look at these changes in school population.

The increase in the Negro and Puerto Rican population has been almost entirely in the areas of early concentration of Negro and Puerto Rican families. These families have moved into areas which were either already saturated or were on the fringes of the saturated areas. It is this heavy population tide with which New York City school integration policies and practices must contend. The tide has been strong enough to negate some of the progress made.

For example, there were 227,933 Negro and Puerto Rican elementary school pupils on register in 1959. By 1960, the number had increased by 14,941 to a total of 242,874. By 1961, the number had increased by an additional 14,094 to a total of 256,968. Total gain in two years - 29,035.

In the same period, there was a noticeable change in the registers of "others" in elementary schools.

In 1959, there were 329,222 "others" on register. By 1960, it had dropped to 324,739, a loss of 4,483. By 1961, it had dropped to 316,154, a loss of another 8,585. Total loss in two years - 13,068.

Equally significant is the fact that these population changes were not spread over the entire city but, rather, were concentrated in specific sections of Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens. For example, in the borough of Manhattan, there were 101,755 pupils on register in elementary schools in 1959: 75,334 were Negro and Puerto Rican, 26,421 were "others". In 1960, there was an increase of 1,280 Negro and Puerto Rican pupils and a loss of 1,104 "others". By November 1961, there had been a further increase of 600 Negro and Puerto Rican pupils, and a loss of 977 "others".

In these two years, we were faced with an increase of 1,880 Negro and Puerto Rican youngsters in Manhattan alone,

THE PROBLEM OF PUPIL GROWTH

A. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL POPULATION

N & P.R.		"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	242,874 - 42.8%	(20%) (113,691)	(.8%) (4,598)	(21.9%) (124,585)	567,613
1961	256,968 - 44.8%	(21.5%) (123,239)	(.9%) (4,912)	(22.5%) (128,817)	573,122

"Others"		"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	324,739 - 57.2%	(.8%) (4,280)	(35.4%) (200,850)	(21.1%) (119,609)	567,613
1961	316,154 - 55.1%	(.8%) (4,322)	(32.0%) (183,396)	(22.4%) (128,436)	573,122

B. JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION

N & P.R		"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	72,120 - 38.9%	(16.8%) (31,138)	(1.7%) (3,161)	(20.4%) (37,821)	185,479
1961	77,981 - 41.9%	(20.3%) (37,865)	(2.0%) (3,815)	(19.5%) (36,301)	186,113

"Others"		"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	113,359 - 61.1%	(1.1%) (2,016)	(40.4%) (74,913)	(19.6%) (36,430)	185,479
1961	108,132 - 58%	(1.5%) (2,796)	(34.2%) (63,578)	(22.4%) (41,758)	186,113

Data - Nov. 1961
Compiled - March 1962

"X' schools - Elementary Division - 90% +N and/or P.R.
"Y" schools - Elementary Division - 90% + "Others"
"X" schools - Junior High School Division 85% + N and/or P.R.
"Y" schools - Junior High School Division 85% + "Others"

THE PROBLEM OF PUPIL GROWTH

C. ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION

	N & P.R.	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	30,029 - 15.9%	(0.5%) (853)	(2.8%) (5,204)	(12.7%) (23,972)	188,795
1961	33,184 - 16.7%	(0.4%) (795)	(2.7%) (5,347)	(13.6%) (27,042)	198,256

	"Others"	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	158,766 - 84.1%	(0.1%) (78)	(61.2%) (115,650)	(22.8%) (43,038)	188,795
1961	165,072 - 83.3%	(0.1%) (52)	(59.8%) (118,574)	(23.4%) (46,446)	198,256

D. VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION

	N & P.R.	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	16,842 - 43.5%	(2.5%) (974)	(1.4%) (540)	(39.6%) (15,328)	38,697
1961	18,563 - 45.8%	(2.6%) (1,039)	(1.3%) (540)	(41.9%) (16,984)	40,508

	"Others"	"X" Schools	"Y"Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	21,855 - 56.5%	(0.4%) (142)	(13.4%) (5,189)	(42.7%) (16,524)	38,697
1961	21,945 - 54.2%	(0.4%) (172)	(13.7%) (5,554)	(40.0%) (16,219)	40,508

Data - Nov. 1961
Compiled - April 1962

"X" schools - Academic High School - 85% +N and/or P.R.
"Y" schools - Academic High School - 85% +"Others"
"X" schools - Vocational High School - 85% +N and/or P.R.
"Y" schools - Vocational High School - 85% + "Others"

and a loss of 2,081 "others".

As might be suspected, the junior high school enrollment picture has been a similar one. There, the total enrollment city-wide dropped from 186,595 in 1959 to 185,479 in 1960, a loss of 1,116, and then rose by 634, taking it to 186,113 in 1961.

However, the number of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils increased from 65,880 in 1959 to 72,120 in 1960, a gain of 6,240, and rose again to 77,981 in 1961, a further gain of 5,861.

Now, let us take a look at the changes in the academic high school registration. In 1959, the register of all pupils in academic high schools stood at 189,737; in 1960, it was 188,795 - the loss, a comparatively slight one of 942 pupils. But in the same period, the total register of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils rose from 29,295 in 1959 to 30,029 in 1960, a gain of 734, while the register of "others" dropped from 160,478 in 1959 to 158,766 in 1960, a loss of 1,712.

By 1961, the Negro and Puerto Rican population in high schools increased to 33,184. In the same period, the "others" population rose to 165,072.

Transfers for Improved Utilization of School Facilities

Between 1957 and September 1959, the Central Zoning Unit and various assistant superintendents, transferred almost 28,000 pupils, mostly Negro and Puerto Rican, from crowded schools, in which four hours of instruction was given, to under-utilized schools, and a five hour school day. This is known as the Improved Utilization of School Facilities Program. Although the prime objective of this movement was a longer school day, in uncongested schools, a concomitant outcome was the opportunity for the pupils to benefit from the more stimulating experience of a desegregated education, for the thousands who were moved, as well as for the thousands of "others" in the schools to which they were sent.

By September 1961, another 19,800 pupils in 213 schools were re-zoned. Most of the latter school-to-school changes were effected by the revisions in school boundaries - a procedure which does not always lead to much improvement in desegregation, percentage-wise, but integration is never adversely

affected. For 800 of these pupils, the changes were permissive, that is, parents were given the choice of having their children transferred to schools where there was less crowding. Boundary changes were not involved because the over-crowded and the under-utilized schools were not contiguous.

With respect to the almost 173,000 pupils (Negro, Puerto Rican and "others") still in "X" elementary schools in September 1961, in spite of the Improved Utilization of School Buildings Program, and because they choose not to leave their neighborhood schools, it appears that we are left with no alternative but that of providing in de facto segregated neighborhoods, buildings, services, supplies and teachers comparable to those found anywhere. Unless the housing pattern in New York City changes, we may always have "X" and "Y" schools.

Not to construct new buildings for elementary children in congested areas just because these facilities are certain to become "X" schools would be unrealistic, to say the least. At the same time, to deny parents the opportunities and benefits of an education in a school with a varied ethnic population, whenever this is possible, would be inconsistent with the policies of the New York City Board of Education.

To gradually strip a community of its educational facilities by not replacing the half century old buildings with new schools, even if it is not on a one for one basis, when this has to be done, would not only leave the community with no adequate facilities for the 9-3 educational program, but with no facilities for the 3-5 and the 7-10 recreational program for youngsters and teenagers, as well. It would also mean depriving these same communities of the brightly lighted and modern facilities for evening adult education programs which are demanded in those areas where adults are vocal and aware of the necessity for even the minimal opportunities for continuing their education beyond the elementary and high school level. It would deprive those neighborhoods which are in greatest need of adult education programs, that make it possible for people to keep their jobs and to participate as intelligent citizens in a government which can be no better than the educational level of its people. I do not refer to the needs of a comparatively few who come to the peaks as leaders, but to the broad supporting base of the so-called "ordinary" citizens who really are the foundations of democracy.

Open Enrollment

The second project that has enabled many youngsters to move into schools with a better ethnic balance is the Open Enrollment Program.

Briefly, this program, as it operates in the Elementary School Division, permits any pupil in grades 2, 3, and 4 of schools with 90% or above Negro and/or Puerto Rican population, or 90% or above "other", called "sending" schools, to submit applications to the Central Zoning Unit, for transfer to a "receiving" school with a utilization index of less than 90%, and a more equitably balanced ethnic population consisting of 75% and above "others".

A Pilot Program for K-1 classes of 12 "sending" schools permits any child in these classes to submit applications for transfer to "receiving" schools, where the ratio of "others" is 75% or above.

The number of pupils transferred to each school and to the grades of the school is controlled by the size of the registers in the "receiving" school, and the school's capacity.

On the grade level, the number of pupils assigned to a grade is never above two-thirds of the present register of the grade. The entering pupils are held by this means to 40 or 45% of the new register ("new register" being the sum of those attending the school from the neighborhood and the incoming pupils).

On the junior high school level, pupils in the sixth year of any elementary schools which normally feed junior high schools with 85% or above Negro and/or Puerto Rican population,may apply to the Unit for assignment to junior high schools with a more evenly balanced ethnic composition.

The Open Enrollment Program was initiated in the Fall of 1960 - as an experiment. At that time, 16 elementary schools were designated as "sending" schools, and 31 as "receiving" schools. 284 grade 2, 3, 4 pupils applied, and 212 were assigned.

On the junior high school level, 22 schools were designated "sending" schools, and 31 were selected as "receiving" schools. 393 pupils were assigned to new schools - 343 of these accepted the assignments.

With the experience of the initial programs as a guide, a city-wide program, elementary level, initiated in December 1960, brought in 3,077 applications, for transfer from "present" grades 2, 3, 4 pupils. 2,831 of these accepted the assignments made by the Central Zoning Unit for transfer in September 1961.

In the first city-wide Open Enrollment Junior High School Program, 2,669 pupils were assigned to out-of-district integrated schools.

The K-1 Pilot Program was initiated in March 1961. Out of approximately 4,000 children who were eligible, 296 children applied. 269 registered in the assigned schools the following September. This was to us an indication that the vast majority of parents were not willing to have their very young children travel by bus to an out-of-district school.

In all cases, parents were given a list of "receiving" schools, from which to select the school of their choice. In almost all cases, the Central Zoning Unit was able to assign the youngster to one of the schools selected. Sometimes, especially on the elementary level, parents were advised to revise their selection and accept other schools to which school bus transportation was possible. If, however, the parent insisted on an assignment to one of the schools selected, the child was issued a ticket or pass for public transportation use.

Since December 1961, we have planned for the transfer of 253 K-1 pupils, 1,921 grade 2, 3, 4 pupils and 1,417 sixth year pupils to integrated schools, as of September 1962 under the Open Enrollment Program.

On the high school level, we have planned to redirect minority group children, on a permissive basis, from academic high schools where the Negro and Puerto Rican population is heaviest, grouped under A below, to other schools, grouped under B below, where the "others" population is predominantly heavy.

MANHATTAN AND BRONX - "A"

%N	%P.R.	%O	
48.3	35.2	16.5	
15.2	3.0	81.0	- "B"
11.8	13.3	74.9	
15.1	3.7	81.2	
12.5	13.2	74.3	

QUEENS - "A"

29.6	1.1	69.3	
3.3	.7	96.0	- "B"
1.1	.6	98.3	
.7	.3	99.0	

BROOKLYN - "A"

%N	%P.R.	%O	
8.7	11.2	80.1	
32.4	26.1	41.5	
23.4	4.1	72.5	
10.1	7.6	82.3	
82.0	11.9	6.1	
			- "B"
.4	.7	98.9	
.4	.1	99.5	
.3	.2	99.5	
27.0	13.0	60.0	

This is a one year project, pending the probability of the inclusion of the high schools in the Open Enrollment Program for September 1963.

There is little doubt that the Open Enrollment Program meant extra work for the "sending" and "receiving" schools. Schools that were to receive pupils were notified far in advance as to the probable number assigned. This gave the school administration and the parents sufficient time to make the school organization adjustments that were necessary.

In the "sending" schools, letters to parents and application-for-transfer forms had to be mimeographed in Spanish and in English, and transfer lists prepared for the pilot and the full city-wide programs.

In many schools more than one meeting was held with parent groups, so that the principal could explain the open enrollment purposes and processes, and give advice on the location and travel time to selected schools. Schools worked with community groups to better inform parents of the procedures to be followed. Some community groups sponsored meetings and distributed literature explaining the program.

In the "receiving" schools, parent groups were prepared by various means for the coming of children from out-of-district. In some cases, the school officials planned joint meetings of the parents of the home school and those whose children would be arriving in September. Groups of parents who visited "receiving" schools for the purpose of making an intelligent decision as to their choice, based upon the distances to be traveled and other factors, which they had set up in their own minds as criteria, were well received.

Some school administrators, community people and parents feared that the Open Enrollment Program would have the effect of further reducing the amount of integration in schools which were already between 90% and 99% Negro and/or Puerto Rican and therefore, in effect, would be retrogression. They argued that since this program permitted any child (Negro, Puerto Rican or "others") in such a school to request a transfer to a school with a more evenly balanced pupil population, ethnically, it would in fact decrease the percentage of "others" in the "X" schools.

They felt that some restrictions should be placed upon the ethnic groups permitted to transfer.

To us, this was a calculated risk. Furthermore, we felt very strongly that all children in "X" or "Y" schools, whose parents wished them to have the opportunity of attending a school in which the ethnic population was in better balance, should have this opportunity regardless of whether they were Negro, Puerto Rican or "other". Actually, only 1.9% of those transferred under this program in September 1961 were "other", whereas 4.1% were Puerto Rican and 94% were Negro. On the junior high school level, 5.8% were "other", 8.2% were Puerto Rican and 86% were Negro.

The Open Enrollment Program has provided a new field for the thesis writers. Scores of students seized this operation for "Objective Studies". They wanted to know all about it and some of them didn't have much time. Their term papers were "due early next week". Their questions were inclusive, to say the least. Some were vague, some a bit ridiculous.

Many asked for "all the material you have on integration, desegregation, zoning and bussing of New York City public schools". Our supply of mimeographed material outlining procedures was exhausted by the requests from school administrators, individuals in other cities, and civic groups interested in learning what New York City was doing. One writer

asked for a map of all boroughs with all of the school districts outlined. She did send a stamped self-addressed envelope, however.

Before the program was half under way, well-meaning people were pressing us for information on the effects of the Open Enrollment Program on the children in the "receiving" schools, and those coming from "sending" schools, the effects on their reading scores on the arithmetic levels. They asked, "How are the children received? Did they make friends? Were their parents a part of the PTA of the new schools?"

From the standpoint of integration, no one could successfully defend the position that integration resulted from the mere juxtaposing of children. But no one could argue that integration was possible without this.

Integration is a phenomena of education. It comes like all other learning. It is the result of repeated satisfying experiences. The more numerous the experiences, the deeper the learning. We do not hold that it can come only through school experiences, but we do say that a great deal can be done within the school day, if the youngster's mind is not too adversely bent by what he senses, hears or sees outside of school.

We say, too, that it takes no "objective test" for us to know that some of the children sent to "receiving" schools were below grade, some above grade, a few were doubtless disturbed children. However, the vast majority were normal children, average youngsters.

In the current Open Enrollment Program, a child who is under the care of a special school bureau (because he has an emotional problem, for example) may not be transferred to an out-of-district school without consultation with the bureau representative.

The children transferred, went toward their new experiences starched, primed and "pressed" by anxious mothers. In most cases, they were warmly received. In a few days or weeks, they became their true selves - angels or part imp, just like other children.

Some of the "receiving" school principals are certain that the "sending" school principals have gotten rid of their problem children. The "sending" school principals are

just as positive that only the best children have transferred. The probability is that there is some truth in the claims of both groups of principals.

It would be untrue to say that all parent groups, teachers and administrators were equally receptive to the idea of open enrollment. Some were more enthusiastic about it than others. But the manner in which they cooperated has been extremely encouraging. The acceptance of the program in so many areas, the determination to make it work, and the preparations made in schools and communities to insure its success outweighed by far any misguided resistance.